



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The
American Historical Review

THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL
ASSOCIATION AT WASHINGTON

COUNTING two meetings which were held partly in Washington and partly in Baltimore and Richmond respectively, twelve of the thirty-five annual meetings of the American Historical Association have been held in the national capital—that of 1886, presided over by the venerable George Bancroft, and those of 1888–1891 inclusive, of 1894 and 1895, of 1901, 1905, 1908, 1915, and 1920. The act of January 4, 1889, incorporating the society, provides that it shall have its principal office at Washington, though it may hold its annual meetings where it pleases. Other provisions of the act, concerning relations with the Smithsonian Institution, emphasize the Washington connection, and the Association is always entitled to consider itself more distinctly at home in Washington than in any other city, and to meet there without specific invitation, though always assured of cordial welcome by the resident members. Under such circumstances, if the resident members are obliged to feel that they have done less for the entertainment of their fellow-members on occasion of the annual meeting than has been done in some other cities, they console themselves with the reflection that Washington is the society's legal home, that every citizen of the United States has his or her share in its ownership, and that the city has many intrinsic attractions of its own, independent of whatever pleasures might be devised to accompany a professional gathering of historical scholars. Not the least of these attractions is a winter climate milder than that of most of the cities where the Association has met; but there are also the buildings and other sights of Washington, and, an attraction having especial drawing power for historians, the printed and manuscript treasures of the Library of Congress and the archives—if in their present condition they deserve to be called archives—of the national government.

By whatever attractions drawn, the number of members attending the thirty-fifth meeting, December 28-30, 1920, was much greater than had been expected. At the Washington meeting of 1915 the registration was 430; but railroad fares have grown higher since then, teachers poorer. Moreover, the railroads proved as unwilling this year as the United States Railroad Administration had been in the year preceding to make any concessions as to reduction of railroad fares for such an occasion. They could not be persuaded to class the American Historical Association's meeting among "meetings of religious, educational, charitable, fraternal, or military character". Most members, it is hoped, found the meeting both educational and fraternal; at all events, members came in unexpected numbers. The registration amounted to 360. The other societies meeting at the same time—the American Political Science Association, the American Sociological Society, the American Catholic Historical Association, the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, and the Agricultural History Society—also had gratifying numbers registering. The subscription dinner, in which all the societies joined, had an attendance of three hundred, and the breakfast-conferences and luncheon-conferences for informal discussion of themes or projects assumed to have a special interest for merely a limited number of members had on this occasion so embarrassing a number of attendants that at meetings hereafter held it will seem difficult to combine the feeding of the multitude with the preaching of the word.

The subscription dinner deserves a special comment. Such functions are expensive, and the Association had seldom ventured to have them; but this particular dinner, a joint affair of all the societies, amply justified itself. No one who heard the incisive remarks of the French ambassador on historical processes and modern events, or the Secretary of War's penetrating and brilliant discussion of the relation of history to the Great War, or Dr. J. J. Walsh's witty speech on historical assumptions respecting progress, is likely ever to forget the occasion. Dr. Walsh spoke as representative of the American Catholic Historical Association, of which he had that day been elected president. Others who spoke were Dr. Paul S. Reinsch, president of the American Political Science Association, and Dr. Edward A. Ross for the American Sociological Society. At the beginning, graceful words of welcome on behalf of the municipal government were spoken by Miss Mabel Boardman, one of the Commissioners for the District of Columbia.

Other occasions on which there was union of societies were the

joint session with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, presided over by the president of that society, Professor Chauncey S. Boucher, of the University of Texas; the joint session with the Agricultural History Society, at which its president, Dr. Rodney H. True, of the Department of Agriculture, acted as chairman; and three joint sessions with the American Political Science Association. The first of these three was the occasion when the presidents of the two societies delivered their annual addresses, Dr. Herbert Putnam, librarian of Congress, presiding. The thoughtful address of Professor Edward Channing, of Harvard, as president of the American Historical Association, entitled *An Historical Retrospect*, was printed in our last issue.¹ That of Dr. Reinsch, on *Secret Diplomacy: How far can it be Eliminated?* is expected to appear later in one of the journals of political science.

The second of these joint sessions was concerned with Pan-American Political and Diplomatic Relations, and was held, appropriately, under the chairmanship of Dr. Leo S. Rowe, the new director of the Pan-American Union, and in the Union's beautiful building; (nearly all other meetings were held in the New Willard Hotel, the Association's headquarters). In both this session and the luncheon-conference on the history of Latin America which preceded it, the same tendency was noticeable that has been seen on previous occasions when the Association has made provision for the consideration of Hispanic American history, the tendency, namely, to turn away from that history to the consideration of present-day problems of the mutual relations between the Latin American republics and the United States. The truth is that while interest in these present relations is acute and extensive, and while the history of those portions of the present United States that were once under Spain is being cultivated with exceptional ardor, the historical study of the regions to the southward of our boundaries is still in its infancy among us.

The third of these joint sessions occurred on the last evening, when, under the chairmanship of Baron Korff, formerly of the University of Helsingfors but now of Washington, papers were read on aspects of recent European history and politics. At the close of the session, Baron Korff in graceful words expressed thanks on behalf of the Association to the committees who had been in charge of the meeting and to those who as hosts had entertained the members. In the Historical Association, the chairman of the committee of local arrangements was Dr. H. Barrett Learned, the secretary

¹ Pp. 191-202, above.

Dr. George F. Zook, of the Bureau of Education. The chairman of the committee on the programme was Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes, of Columbia University. The entertainments included a "smoker" at the Cosmos Club, an evening reception by the National Club House Committee of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae, and a most pleasant afternoon reception at the French embassy by the ambassador and Madame Jusserand.

The "luncheon-conferences" were four. One was composed, as has already been mentioned, of persons chiefly interested in Latin America, another of those interested in the history of the Far East. Another was devoted, with excellent results, to practical considerations respecting the study and teaching of economic history. In this conference formal papers were read. Professor Clive Day, of Yale University, who presided, spoke on the recognition of economic history as a distinct subject, reviewing its history, and discriminating between those elementary courses in which its fusion with general history is desirable and those more advanced stages of instruction to which separate and special courses are more appropriate. Professor Abbott P. Usher, of the School of Business Administration in Boston University, spoke on the field for the teaching of economic history in colleges and secondary schools. It appears that in most colleges and universities where economic history finds a place the chief provision for it consists in a course which gives one semester to the economic history of Europe and one to that of America. Many difficulties, especially in the intricate subjects of medieval agriculture and commerce, are avoided by beginning the European part of the course with the Industrial Revolution, but such a procedure sacrifices too much of what is stimulating to the student, to whom the contrast between medieval and modern conditions, medieval and modern forms of social organization, especially in the field of industry, is sure to be highly instructive. Within the last few years economic history has become an important subject in the curricula of business schools, especially their undergraduate divisions, now rapidly growing. Here, little other history can be taught; economic history must give elementary training in both historical and statistical method, and must be co-ordinated with the work descriptive of industries and, in general, of present-day economic organization. The speaker doubted the wisdom of trying to extend economic history into the field of secondary and vocational education.

In the same conference, Professor Hayes, of Columbia University, spoke on the relation of courses in economic history to courses

in history and in economics, respectively; Professor Frank T. Carlton, of De Pauw University, on the history of labor as a field for historical research, with especial emphasis on the need for comparative study of the structure and operation of different types of labor organizations, considered as social forces.

Much the most numerous attended of these luncheon-conferences was that which was concerned with the opportunities for historical research in Washington. By the courtesy of the librarian of Congress, it took place in the Library. The circumstances confined the speakers—Dr. Gaillard Hunt, of the Department of State, Mr. Charles Moore, chief of the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress, Mr. Theodore Belote, curator of American history in the National Museum, and Professor Frederick J. Turner—to the elements of the subject, but it was impressive and most gratifying to see the eager interest with which their hearers, mostly young graduate students, absorbed these elements of knowledge and incitement concerning the historical treasures of Washington. Would that some adequate appreciation of the opportunities presented here might be diffused among the members of the historical profession, and all others who are interested in history! How do they escape the knowledge that Washington is far the best place for the study of most of the really important parts of American history? Certainly no city in the world so richly provided with historical materials is so little resorted to for purposes of historical writing. From a country of such enormous wealth, there should be, outside the number of those who earn their living in Washington by the teaching of history or other historical work, and the occasional professors who come on leave of absence, at least fifty scholars able to *vivere suo* who have settled down in Washington to lead the historical student's life and exploit this wonderfully opulent mass of material. There are not five. But apparently the well-to-do young American, though nowadays he goes or is sent to college, seldom acquires from either parents or teachers the conviction that there is an inviting career in further study. He is not found in the graduate school. Yet historical writing has never been a poor man's pursuit, but always a pursuit of the well-to-do or the endowed—and in America, with no Congregation of St. Maur, the endowed class has embraced only professors of history, and them only in the happy years from 1880 to 1914, when professors still had some free time!

But to return to the meeting. Before proceeding to those papers which can best be taken into consideration individually, one should speak of two sessions which had more the character of "experience

meetings", or of free conferences unencumbered by meals, than of assemblages for the reading of formal papers—the usual annual meeting of the Conference of Historical Societies and the conference which met to discuss the report of the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship in the Schools. The former, presided over by Dr. James Sullivan, state historian of New York, was given the shape of a joint meeting of the representatives of historical societies and of the National Association of State War History Organizations. For the latter body, which now embraces some fifteen of the organizations which states have formed for the collection and preservation of their records of service in the Great War, Mr. Karl Singewald, of the historical division of the Maryland Council of Defense, presented a report of Progress in the Collection of War Records by State War History Organizations; Professor Albert E. McKinley, secretary of the Pennsylvania War History Commission, a paper of Suggestions and Plans for State and Local Publications of War History. The materials chiefly collected are, first, the service-records of individuals; secondly, other military records, such as histories of units, diaries, rosters, photographs, etc.; thirdly, various materials relating to economic participation in the war, and to welfare and morale work. The projected publications correspond: histories of military participation, histories of economic effort, histories of the welfare movements.

In respect to the work of historical societies, the main subject was that of co-operation of societies within the individual state. Dr. Joseph Schafer, superintendent of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, described the intensive survey of the settlement of that state which is being carried on by the co-operative efforts of that society and of the local historical societies, and to which has been given the appropriate title of the Wisconsin Domesday Book; Dr. Worthington C. Ford and Dr. James Sullivan described respectively the work of the Bay State Historical League in Massachusetts, and of the various county and regional federations of historical societies in New York, and dwelt upon the stimulus given to local societies by the contacts afforded by these groupings.

At the close of the session the Conference of Historical Societies, which enjoys a certain autonomy under the auspices of the Association, held its annual business meeting. Mr. George S. Godard was re-elected chairman for the present year and two special committees were appointed, one to publish if possible a handbook of historical societies, the other to consider a continuation of the bibliography of historical societies compiled to 1905 by Mr. A. P. C.

Griffin and printed as volume II. of the *Annual Report* of the Association for that year. Dr. Dunbar Rowland made a report as chairman of the committee appointed by the Conference in 1907, on co-operation among American historical societies and state departments of history. The project undertaken by the committee, namely, the calendaring of all documents in Parisian archives relating to the Mississippi Valley, for which the societies and departments of that region had raised a fund of \$3000, has been substantially completed, so far as the gathering of material for it is concerned. Dr. Rowland recommended that the offer of the Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington to edit and publish the calendar be accepted and that the special committee be discharged. This recommendation was adopted.

The Committee on History and Education for Citizenship in the Schools was constituted in 1918, first by the National Board for Historical Service and later by the Association, in order to consider those extensive modifications in the methods of historical teaching in schools which, it was then felt, must be brought about as a result of the Great War, in order that history might do its full part in training the minds of the young for proper service to a new era. The history of the committee's work may be traced in these pages and in those of the *Historical Outlook*, where also preliminary reports from it have been printed.² Many obstacles have delayed the presentation of its final report. The object of the present conference was the discussion of portions of its proposals, already made known by some of its previous publications.

In the first of the two formal addresses presented, both of them by members of the committee, Professor Henry Johnson, of Teachers College, Columbia University, discussed the questions of Local and American History in Grades II.-VI. and World History in the High School. He described three groups of dominant ideas respecting the aims and subject-matter of history as a theme of instruction: (1) that the past should be used, as needed, to elucidate the present, without regard to boundaries of subjects, such as geography, literature, economics, history, etc.; (2) that there should be systematic study of history, but that the selection of subjects or events to be studied should be determined solely by present interests; (3) that there should be a study of history for its own sake, because it represents what the past was and how the present came to be. The work of the committee was based on the last conception. Professor

² See this journal, XXIV. 351-353, 746; XXV. 372-373; *Historical Outlook*, X. 273-281, 349-351, 448-451; XI. 73-83, 111-115.

Johnson then gave concrete illustrations of methods of teaching pupils in the grades. The central idea was that of so presenting material as to lead pupils to do constructive thinking; to use the historical method in implanting the idea of change, in evaluating evidence, and in forming conclusions. The speaker approved the proposal of a course in world history in the high schools.³

The secretary of the committee, Mr. Daniel C. Knowlton, outlined the proposed course in modern history for grade X., consisting of a preliminary course of one semester in ancient and medieval history, and a semester in modern history. Main topics and sub-topics were enumerated, chosen for the purpose of showing the progress towards democracy in Europe, for grade X., to be followed by a course in American history with a similar purpose, for grade XI., and one in problems resulting from the growth of democracy, for grade XII. Miss Harriet Tuell, president of the New England History Teachers' Association, criticized the committee's plan as inadequate, as running beyond the capacity of the average high-school pupil, and as laying undue emphasis on one phase of European development, the growth of democracy.

In view of the transfer of the chairman of this committee, Professor Schafer, from Oregon to a new occupation in Wisconsin, and of other changes of occupation by other members, the committee asked to be discharged and to have its work reviewed and concluded by a fresh committee. The Council acceded to this request and appointed a new committee to be called the Committee on History Teaching in Schools, of which the chairman is Professor Johnson.

Another session having a special character was that devoted to the history of science. Its chairman, Dr. Robert S. Woodward, the retiring president of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, welcomed the attitude of the American Historical Association towards the history of science, emphasized the need of breaking down the artificial barriers which separate one department of learning or science from another, and recalled plans of earlier years for a general history of the inductive sciences. Of the three papers read, the first was one by Dr. Fielding H. Garrison, librarian of the Surgeon-General's Office, on Recent Realignment in the History of Medieval Medicine and Science. While the most important medical texts of classical antiquity and the Middle Ages were issued in type

³ Mr. Johnson's address, together with a preliminary report by Mr. Schafer, will be found in the *Historical Outlook* for March, XII. 87-97.

by the Renaissance printers, much of the scientific and medical literature of those times remained in manuscript, and it was not till quite recent years that either the early printed books or the thousands of medical and other scientific manuscripts have been subjected to careful examination. The result has been to show that the medieval physicians were weak in anatomy and in physiology; that internal medicine was with them a matter of tradition, both as to theory and as to practice; but that in surgery and in hygiene their accomplishment was considerable. Other branches of science developed in the Middle Ages chiefly through the pursuit of practical inventions.

The second of these papers in the history of science was one on Developments in Electromagnetism during the Last Hundred Years, by Professor Arthur E. Kennelly, of Harvard.⁴ The occasion of this survey was the hundredth anniversary of Oersted's discovery of the connection between electricity and magnetism—of the deflecting of the magnetic needle by an electric current. The development of the subject was traced, from Ampère's epoch-making paper of the same year, 1820, through his subsequent researches, through Faraday's discovery of electromagnetic induction, through the applications to telegraphy, ocean cables, and the telephone, through Clerk Maxwell's researches into the relations between electricity and light, the subsequent investigation of radio-electric waves, and the study of the electron theory of matter. This session concluded with a paper by Professor James H. Robinson, of the New School of Social Research, in New York, on Free Thought, Yesterday and Today. Treating his subject with characteristic wit and pungency of statement, from the point of view of the student of intellectual history, he compared especially the modes of thought of the eighteenth-century deists and other philosophers with our own, and set forth the gains to modern thinking derived from the scientific advance of the last century.

Proceeding now to the main body of substantive papers, or papers read as contributions to history, it must be said that on the whole they seemed to be of less importance or excellence than the average of what has been brought forward on such occasions in the past, yet some were of exceptionally high quality. The most convenient plan for giving some notion of what the papers not already mentioned contained is perhaps to deal with them in the chronological order of their subjects, beginning with ancient history. In the session devoted to that field, the first paper was read by Dr. Donald

⁴ Printed in a modified form in the *Boston Transcript* of Jan. 26, 1921.

McFayden, of the University of Nebraska, on the Growth of Autocracy in the Roman Empire. Its main features were an argument that the powers granted to the *princeps* in 23 B. C. did not include a legal *majus imperium* over the senatorial provinces, and, derived from this, a theory of the evolution of the *princeps*' relation to the administration of justice. Contrary to the accepted view, he held that under the Augustan constitution the *princeps* possessed no jurisdiction except over the imperial provinces, that the activities of his judicial court and of that held by the *praefectus urbi* as his deputy were technically unconstitutional, and that the appellate jurisdiction of the *princeps* was simply an outgrowth of the tendency to refer all difficult problems to his arbitrament—to make him the chief jurisconsult of the empire. Hadrian's action in organizing a council of eminent jurisconsults to assist him in rendering his decisions fixed him in that position. The extra-legal origin of the jurisdiction exercised by the *princeps* and his deputies was held to explain the relatively informal character of their procedure, while the alliances between the empire and the professional lawyers impregnated the later Roman law with the spirit of absolutism.

Next followed an important paper on the Origin of the Russian State on the Dnieper, by Professor Mikhail Rostovtsev, formerly of the Petrograd Academy of Sciences, now of the University of Wisconsin. In the ninth century, when the Russian annals begin to give a systematic record, we find Russia to have already a civilization of its own and a well-defined political, social, and economic structure, having for its basis a group of commercial city-states, defended and in part ruled by alien princes invited from without, one of whom, in that century, succeeded in uniting the whole group of cities under one dynasty and into one state, with its capital at Kiev. The problem of the paper was to account for this form of organization, so strikingly different from the agricultural and feudal form prevalent at that epoch in western Europe. It was to be solved only by taking into consideration that earlier history of South Russia of which a portion was treated by Professor Rostovtsev in an article printed in our last number.⁵ The civilization depicted in that article as prevailing under the joint influence of the Greek colonial cities and the Iranian-Scythian empire was not destroyed when the Sarmatian power replaced the Scythian, nor when Celtic and after them Germanic invaders came. They took over, as it was their interest to do, the commercial relations which they found; and when the Germans passed on into the Roman Empire and the West,

⁵ Pp. 203-224, above.

the Slavs, in the main, simply took their place, founded a state of the same type, took over their towns, their trade-relations, and their civilization—not a Germanic, nor thereafter a Slavonic, civilization, but the ancient Graeco-Iranian civilization of the Scythians and Sarmatians, with slight modifications. The Slavonic is but one of the epochs in the evolution of Russia, but with this difference, that the Slavs made Russia their final aim and home.

A paper on the Problem of Control in Medieval Industry, by Dr. Austin P. Evans, of Columbia University, addressed itself to questions made timely by the recent tendency to extol medieval economic organization as worthy of imitation in our time. The author showed how medieval theories respecting property and value left the government, of state or city, free to control the production and sale of goods. As to the warmly debated question, whether guilds freely controlled industry, whether guilds were everywhere under the control of civil authorities of state or town, or whether guilds had a larger measure of autonomy while the civil authorities maintained residuary power, Mr. Evans held that most commonly the guilds were under the ulterior control of the state, but he deprecated sweeping generalizations in a field marked by so much variety, and also all tendency to idealize the economic organization prevalent in the Middle Ages.

The only other paper in medieval history was one by Professor Louis J. Paetow, of the University of California, on Latin as an International Language in the Middle Ages. Modern civilization, he pointed out, rests on the achievements of Latin Christendom in that period, yet, though the Latin language was the chief engine of civilization throughout those ages, so little effort has been applied to the scholarly study of medieval Latin that Du Cange's *Glossarium*, published in 1678 and augmented largely in the eighteenth century, is still referred to as its standard dictionary. Made international by the Western Church, that speech remained the common medium of communication and literature throughout western Europe, its chief bond of union, until the Italian humanists, while enthusiastically awakening classical Latin to new life, fatally checked the development of the current Latin as a living and international language. Recent efforts to restore Latin to that position were described.

The paper of Professor George M. Dutcher, of Wesleyan University, on the Enlightened Despotism, opened with a brief analysis in which the enlightened despotism was characterized as based upon the authority of reason and not upon humanitarianism. Next the

origin of the movement in Prussia, rather than in the more progressive nations, England and France, was explained. Conditions in the German lands at the close of the Thirty Years' War were sketched with special reference to the situation of the Hohenzollern possessions, and the constructive policy and work of the Great Elector were outlined as the earliest manifestation of the enlightened despotism, whose foremost exponent was that prince's great-grandson, Frederick the Great. Special emphasis was laid upon Frederick's achievement in internal administration during the ten years' truce beginning in 1745, and its imitation by Maria Theresa, in the rival campaigns of preparedness preceding the Seven Years' War. The priority of these reforming activities in administration to the appearance of the famous writings on government by the French philosophical thinkers was brought out as evidence that the enlightened despotism developed as a practical achievement, not as a response to the stimulus of political theorists. In short, it was an effort at administrative efficiency designed for the aggrandizement of the state, which was conceived of as an entity above rulers as well as above subjects and as founded on the authority of reason rather than on divine right.

Later periods of European history were traversed in a summary survey of the Break-up of the Hapsburg Empire, by Professor Archibald C. Coolidge, of Harvard University, and in a paper on Sinn Fein, by Professor Edward R. Turner, of the University of Michigan. Dr. Ralph H. Lutz, of Stanford University, narrated the history of the Spartacist Uprising in Germany, of which he had been an eye-witness in Berlin. Miss Ruth Putnam, in a paper entitled the Aspirations of One Small State, described the evolution of the grand-duchy of Luxemburg from the time when it first obtained the opportunity of self-determination, after the armistice of November, 1918, to recent days. This paper, too, was based in large part on the data of an eye-witness. Problems of labor, finance, railroads, and economic affiliation with the neighboring countries were described, and some account given of the course and achievements of parties under a new constitution providing for woman suffrage and proportional representation.

In a paper on the Establishment of a New Poland, Col. Lucius H. Holt, of the United States Military Academy, traced the establishment of a new government, and political events in Poland from the outbreak of the war in 1914 to the present date. The paper emphasized the work of the Supreme National Committee during the years from 1914 to 1916. It traced briefly the influences which

led the Central Powers to recognize Poland in the autumn of 1915, and the subsequent incidents which revealed the duplicity of Germany and turned the Poles against that country. It summarized the points in the allied recognition of Poland in 1918. It outlined the clash of conflicting political forces in Poland during the armistice period and the result, spoke of the elections of January, 1919, and closed with a statement of the progress made by the Polish Assembly upon the draft of a constitution.

The last of the papers which we may describe as bearing on the history of the Old World was that of Dr. Stephen P. Duggan, director of the Institute of International Education, on Syria, Palestine, and Mandates.⁶ When the Great War broke out, the Allies found strong support among the Syrian patriots and leaders who under the rule of the Young Turks, or exiled by them, had been contending for an autonomous or independent Syria administered by Arabs with Arabic as official language. Unfortunately, the agreement of October 25, 1915, made between the Sherif of the Hejaz and the British High Commission at Cairo, conflicted with the provisions of the Sykes-Picot treaty between France and Great Britain as to the disposition of the Arab lands of the Ottoman Empire. Moreover, that treaty was considered by the Arabs to be superseded by the Anglo-French declaration of November 8, 1918. When, therefore, after the occupation of the territory by General Allenby, mandates were given by the Supreme Council to Great Britain for Palestine and to France for Syria, the Arab Nationalists considered that they had been deceived, opposed the erection of a Zionist commonwealth in Palestine, and entered on a course of conflict with the British in Palestine and of warfare with the French elsewhere in Syria.

At the end of this last session, Dr. Victor Andrés Belaunde, of the University of San Marcos of Lima, Peru, read a brief paper on the Communistic System of the Incas, and the comparison between its features and those of Russian communism under Lenin and Trotsky.

Passing now to the papers in American history, it is to be noted that, appropriately to the date, one session was devoted to commemorating the tercentenary of the arrival of the Pilgrim Fathers. In this session three papers were read, of which the first, by Professor Clive Day, of Yale University, dealt with Capitalistic and Socialistic Tendencies in the Puritan Colonies. Its special object was to consider a view recently advanced by the late Professor

⁶ Printed in the *Journal of International Relations*,

Max Weber of Heidelberg, that, in the development of the modern capitalist and of a capitalistic society, as set forth in Sombart's familiar analysis, an essential source of the capitalist spirit is to be found in the religious beliefs and ethical principles of the Puritans. Confining himself to the Puritans of New England, the speaker set forth the results of a careful examination of their sermons and laws as expressions of their ethical ideals. He did not find that encouragements to industry and thrift bulked large in their sermons and concluded that whatever urgency was manifest toward the accumulation of capital, greatly needed in the colonies, was social, rather than individual and capitalistic, in its motives.

Mr. Lincoln N. Kinnicutt, of Worcester, followed with a paper entitled, *The Settlement of Plymouth Contemplated before 1620*. Its thesis was that Sir Ferdinando Gorges desired a settlement at Plymouth Harbor and did what he could to guide the Pilgrims thither, supplying them with information and endeavoring to arrange that Captain Dermer and Tisquantum should be at hand to point their way, possibly also making private arrangements with Captain Jones of the *Mayflower*.

Thirdly, Professor David S. Muzzey, of Columbia University, in a paper on the Heritage of the Puritans, after acknowledging the defects characteristic of Puritanism but urging that all estimates of these should be based on comparisons with contemporaneous phenomena rather than with those of the present time, set forth in admirable style three principal portions of our inheritance from the Puritans and Pilgrims: the results of their political philosophy, with its insistence on covenant as the basis of civil relations, the influence of the New England town, primordial cell of local self-government, and the emphasis which the Puritans permanently placed upon unremitting education for responsibility.

The paper on the Slave Trade into South Carolina before the Revolution, by Miss Elizabeth Donnan, of Wellesley College, a product of researches conducted on behalf of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, derived its information for the first third of the eighteenth century from official papers, dealing with those aspects of the trade in which British officials and British merchants concerned themselves, such as the import taxes imposed by the colony, payment of debts to British merchants, and monopoly by the Royal Company. From 1732 we have the files of the *South Carolina Gazette* and from 1748 the business letters of Henry Laurens. From these two sources much can be learned concerning the actual process of buying and selling the black cargoes, which were handled

by importing merchants, prominent in Charleston society, who were giving to their British principals copious information concerning weather, crops, prices, and other factors which influenced the market. The paper described in detail such matters as the terms of contract between principal and factor and between factor and purchasing planter, the methods of the auction sales, the range of territory covered, and the risks and difficulties which the factor encountered.

The paper which was read by Professor Fiske Kimball, of the University of Virginia, on Architecture in the History of the Colonies and of the Republic, in which he traversed several current notions as to the influence of pioneer conditions on American colonial building, and emphasized the American elements in the development of classical architecture in the early years of the republic, will be printed in a later issue of this journal.

The paper entitled John Wesley, Tory, by Professor William W. Sweet, of De Pauw University, treated of the activities and influence of Wesley during the American Revolution. In the ten years beginning with 1768 Wesley published ten political pamphlets. The first three were caused by the excitement concerning the case of John Wilkes, and took the side of king and government; the fourth was devoted to the slave trade, of which Wesley was one of the earliest opponents. The remaining six have to do with the American Revolution, the first and most important of them being *A Calm Address to Our American Colonies* (1775). In all of them Wesley invariably supports the king and government. The reasons for his course are complex: he was born and bred a High Churchman and a Tory; he believed in the divine right of kings, for that theory seemed to him the most religious; he was a firm supporter of law and order; he hated rebellion; the king had been kindly disposed toward the Methodists; the king's private life and his court were free from scandal; Lord Dartmouth was a leader in the Evangelical movement. Wesley's position on the American War led to some suspicion and even persecution of American Methodists as Tories, but at the close of the war he was wise enough to recognize the result as providential and set about to organize the American Methodists into an independent church.

In the paper by Professor Homer C. Hockett, of the Ohio State University, on the American Background of Federalism, the endeavor was to show the part played by American influences in the development of the two chief modern federations, the American Union and the British Empire. He held that the immediate back-

ground of our own federalism lay rather in the relations of the colonies to one another than in the previous practices of the British Empire; that while the modern British imperial organization, as a league of autonomous commonwealths, was foreshadowed by the American position in the controversy preceding the Revolution, British policy was not changed by the American contention; but that the essential change in that policy resulted rather from the undermining of mercantilism, and thus of the old colonial system, by Adam Smith's political economy, and from the aggressive demands of the Canadians for responsible government.

Of the papers on American history in the early part of the nineteenth century, that of Professor Louis M. Sears, of Purdue University, on Philadelphia and the Embargo of 1808,⁷ adverted first to the ambiguous position of that city in respect to economic status at that time. As a commercial city, Philadelphia was subject to the distress entailed by the embargo upon all sections of the commercial population. But Philadelphia, in common with Baltimore and other ports of the Middle States, possessed an incitement to manufactures in her proximity to the new Trans-Alleghany settlements. She seized her opportunity, actually developed a considerable manufacturing industry, and won prosperity for a greater number of her citizens than the embargo had impoverished. The material expression of this prosperity was a building boom involving the construction of over a thousand houses. The political expression was a continued confidence in the Democratic party and in the wisdom and goodness of Thomas Jefferson, Philadelphia being, according to one's point of view, either the shining exception to the folly of the Jeffersonian system, or else the shining example of its wisdom.

In the joint session held with the Agricultural History Society, Professor Percy W. Bidwell, of Yale University, read a paper, which we shall later have the privilege of presenting in full to our readers, on the Agricultural Revolution in New England, 1815-1860, showing how the development of New England manufactures and the creation of factory villages began a transition from farming for a living to farming for profit, how the building of railroads, just as this transition to commercial agriculture was well under way, subjected the New England farmer to disastrous competition from the westward, and how he carried out the readjustment of his economic system which was thus forced upon him.

In the same joint session, Mr. Herbert A. Kellar, of the McCor-

⁷ An outline of this paper appears in the *Quarterly Journal of Economics* for February, pp. 354-359.

mick Library, Chicago, read a paper on the Influence of the Agricultural Fair upon American Society, 1830-1851, and Mr. Rudolf A. Clemen, of Northwestern University, one on the Economic Bases of the American System of Large-Scale Meat-Packing. Sketching the earlier history of the American trade in livestock and meat and that of the period when Cincinnati was the centre and pork the staple, Mr. Clemen devoted his attention chiefly to the period since the establishment of the Chicago stock-yards in 1865, and to the economic results of the four chief factors, all introduced about 1870-1875, which gave the meat industry the form it has since borne—the system of ranges and ranches in the Far West, the extension of routes of transportation to the sources of supply, the development of refrigeration and of the refrigerator car, and the rise of the great organizers of distribution.

There was but one paper relating to the period of the Civil War, that of Professor Charles W. Ramsdell, of the University of Texas, on the Control of Manufacturing by the Confederate Government. He showed that while the strong individualism of the South prevented the Confederacy from regulating manufactures as a feature of its civil policy, a rigorous control was established over the production of cloth and leather through military agencies, particularly the quartermaster's bureau. By means of the conscription and impressment laws, the supplies of labor, wool, hides, and railway transportation came under the control of the War Department, which was able to force the factories and tanneries to contract almost exclusively with the government when they preferred the higher profits of the public market. The state government of North Carolina, however, interposed successfully to prevent Confederate control of manufactures in that state and to preserve their products for the exclusive use of North Carolina troops.

Only two papers bore on the history of the United States between 1865 and 1900, none on our history in the twentieth century. Both of these two bore on aspects of that period which derive their significance from the economic problems which emerged with the growth of capitalism after the Civil War and which are still unsolved. The first was a paper by Professor John D. Hicks, of Hamline University, Minnesota, on the Political Career of Ignatius Donnelly, who figured in the politics of Minnesota and of the nation, throughout the period named, as the champion, ardent but unpractical, of every movement that gave promise of bettering the lot of the ordinary man and securing his rights against the claims of property. Indifferent to party—by turns Anti-Monopolist, Green-

backer, Democrat, Republican, Farmers' Alliance man, Populist, Middle-of-the-Roader—he sought his cherished reforms most commonly through third-party movements. His final rejection of opportunist tactics was exhibited when the main body of Populists adopted the policy of fusion with the Democratic party in 1896.

In a paper on Agrarian Discontent in the South during the Eighties and Nineties of the last century, Professor B. B. Kendrick, of Columbia University, dwelt on only two of the causes of that discontent. The primary cause, social, lay in the fact that the Southern farmer occupied in 1890, in the economical, the political, and especially the social life of the country, a position much lower than he had in 1860. The principal economic cause of his unrest lay in the lien-law system—an evil peculiar to the Southern farmer—under which the farmer was almost a serf to the city merchant to whom he happened to be indebted. Other elements in the Southern situation were not peculiar to that section, but were such as, in the case of the West, have been adequately treated in the books of Buck, Haines, Garland, White, and others; but the history of the Southern farmer in that period still awaits systematic investigation.

Papers on Pan-American Political and Diplomatic Relations, the general theme of one of the sessions held jointly by the Historical and the Political Science associations, fall last to be described. That of Professor Herman G. James, of the University of Texas, on Recent Constitutional Changes in Latin America, is printed in full elsewhere.⁸ That of Professor Julius Klein, of Harvard, entitled the Monroe Doctrine as a Regional Understanding, was, so far as its historical content is concerned, devoted to an interesting exposition of the ways and extent in which the period of the Great War has brought to the South American republics appreciation of their own capacity for self-development, promoted international co-operation within South America in economic and social matters, enhanced the application of South American capital to industrial and commercial enterprises, and furthered economic independence of Europe while multiplying contacts with North America. The probable bearing of all this on the development of the Monroe Doctrine was described.⁹

Professor Manoel de Oliveira Lima, the eminent Brazilian scholar who has lately become a member of the Catholic University of America, concluded this series with a paper on Pan-Americanism and the League of Nations, in which, after reviewing some earlier

⁸ *Current History*.

⁹ This paper, and that of Dr. Oliveira Lima next mentioned, will appear in the May number of the *Hispanic-American Historical Review*.

attempts at forming leagues which had originated in South America, he advocated, as the most desirable feature of any league of nations, a supreme court to deal with differences, interpretations, and controversies, and dwelt on the "Pan-American conscience", the consciousness of the need of union in the New World, and its common respect for public law, as secure foundations for any closer relations between its members.

It remains to narrate the transactions of the annual business meeting. The delay in the printing of our January number made it possible to insert in that number, on pages 411 and 412, some account of these transactions, but a fuller narrative is, according to custom, expected in this place, and may be given in spite of some repetition necessarily involved.

The secretary's report showed a membership of 2524, a gain of 79 since the preceding year; the gain is to be attributed to the activity of the Committee on Membership. The treasurer's report showed receipts of \$10,483, expenditures of \$9,786; but the cost of printing the *American Historical Review* has increased to so extraordinary a degree, especially in the latter months of the year, that drastic measures will be necessary in order to avoid a deficit for the year 1921. These costs of manufacture have been steadily rising since the year before the Great War. The publishers' estimates seem to show that in 1921 they will surpass those of the year last mentioned by more than eighty per cent. Instead of paying to the Macmillan Company fifty cents per copy for copies supplied to members of the Association as required by the present contract, it becomes necessary to pay hereafter seventy cents, or per annum \$2.80, nearly the total sum paid to the Association by each member as his annual dues. Therefore the Association voted to submit to the next annual meeting an amendment to the constitution increasing the annual dues from three dollars to five dollars (and the life-membership fee from fifty dollars to one hundred), and in the meantime to authorize the treasurer, when sending out the bills in September, to invite voluntary contributions of from two to five dollars additional to the dues. The text of the proposed amendment to the constitution is given in the appendix to this article. Provision was also made for a Committee on Increase of the Endowment which now stands at \$31,639.

The special Committee on Policy, appointed three years ago, submitted an elaborate report. Many of its recommendations require additional funds for their execution. Such as could be carried into effect under existing conditions were adopted. Thus, in

order to secure permanence and continuity of policy of the Committee on Programme, it was voted that three members of that committee should serve for terms of three years so arranged that one member should retire each year, while the other members were to serve for terms of one year and be selected with reference to locality.¹⁰ Other recommendations of the Committee on Policy, adopted by the Association, provided for continuance or revival of the Public Archives Commission, the Committee on Bibliography, and the Committee on the Documentary Historical Publications of the United States Government, for the discharge, at its own request, as mentioned on a previous page, of the present Committee on History and Education for Citizenship in the Schools and the substitution of a new Committee on History Teaching in Schools, and for the establishment of a standing Committee on Military History, whose chief function should be to co-operate with the Historical Branch of the General Staff of the United States Army, and other governmental agencies, national and state, engaged in preparing historical works relative to the recent war. As a means of carrying out the desires which have at times been expressed for a special journal of European history, or an organ for the publication of brief monographs in that field, the Committee on Policy recommended the establishment, when means are at hand, of a series of Historical Studies; the details were referred to a committee.

The budget proposed by the Council is printed on a later page, in connection with an outline of the treasurer's report.

Under the terms of the will of the late George Louis Beer a prize was established, to be known as the George Louis Beer Prize, for the "best work upon any phase of European international history since the year 1895"; a committee was appointed to shape rules for its award. The prize offered in military history, to which the Council had appropriately given the name of the Robert M. Johnston Prize, was awarded to Mr. Thomas R. Hay, for an essay on Hood's Tennessee Campaign. It was announced that the committee on the Justin Winsor Prize had been unable to agree, and the three essays most regarded were referred to a new committee on that prize, appointed for the biennium 1921-1922.

A special committee was appointed by the Council, at the instance of the secretary, to consider the general subject of historical writing (as distinguished from historical research) in the United

¹⁰ We are asked by the chairman of the committee, Professor Evarts B. Greene, to say that he will be pleased to receive from any member of the Association suggestions as to the programme—speakers, topics, etc. Until July 1 his address will be the Colonial Club, Cambridge, Mass.

States and to report as to what means, if any, may be adopted to stimulate the better writing of history. The committee appointed consists of Mr. Jusserand, Dr. Charles W. Colby, and Professor W. C. Abbott; its report on this exceedingly important subject will be awaited with much interest.

A committee of which Professor George M. Dutcher is chairman had been appointed at the preceding annual meeting to prepare a Manual of Historical Literature to replace the well-known work by the late Dr. Charles K. Adams. One of the breakfast-conferences held during the sessions was organized in order that those who are to take part in the preparation of this manual might hear a report of progress and discuss various questions of policy. The committee's plan involves some further chapters additional to those in Dr. Adams's book, the inclusion of at least half as many more titles, but with somewhat briefer reviews, in order to keep the size of the volume not much larger, and the assignment of each of the proposed twenty-nine chapters to an expert in its field, as chapter editor, with assistance from other specialists. It is anticipated that the new work, which was originally suggested by the American Library Association, will find its largest usefulness in public libraries and high schools, but that it will not be without value for teachers and students in colleges and universities. Most of the titles will be of works which have appeared since the publication of Dr. Adams's book, and there will be a somewhat larger proportion of books in English treated.

It was voted, on a hospitable invitation from St. Louis, that the next annual meeting should be held in that city. The dates will probably be December 28, 29, and 30.

The annual elections followed precisely the list presented by the Committee on Nominations. His Excellency the French ambassador, Mr. Jusserand, was chosen president for the ensuing year, Professor Charles H. Haskins first vice-president, Professor Edward P. Cheyney second vice-president. Professor John S. Bassett and Mr. Charles Moore were re-elected secretary and treasurer respectively. The election to the Executive Council also followed precisely the committee's list, except that Professor Becker withdrew his name, preferring to continue as a member of the Board of Editors of this journal, whereupon the committee substituted the name of Professor Sioussat. The councillors elected were: Miss Ruth Putnam, Professors Arthur L. Cross, Sidney B. Fay, Carl R. Fish, Carlton J. H. Hayes, Frederic L. Paxson, James T. Shotwell, and St. George L. Sioussat. The Council elected Professor Guy S. Ford

a member of the Board of Editors of this journal, in the place of Professor J. H. Robinson, whose term had expired, and Professor Archibald C. Coolidge in the place of Professor Cheyney, who resigned after being elected a vice-president. For the Committee on Nominations to be presented next autumn, the Association chose Professors Henry E. Bourne, William E. Dodd, Eloise Ellery, Frank H. Hodder, and William E. Lingelbach; the committee has since chosen Professor Hodder as chairman. A full list of the committee assignments for 1921 follows this article.

In view of the small number of the ballots which had been received in the autumnal "primary", and by which the Committee on Nominations had been guided, the outgoing chairman of that committee, Mr. Victor H. Paltsits, proposed for consideration next year an amendment of by-law no. II. which would abolish the provision for this formal balloting, and would leave it to the committee to nominate, with only such indications from other members as letters received from them, or their conversations, might supply. Meantime it was voted that the preliminary ballot should be omitted in 1921. It may, however, properly be pointed out that it would be possible to maintain the present machinery of balloting and nominating committee, yet to instruct the committee, or leave it to understand, that, while deriving whatever instruction it can from the results of the ballot, it is not bound to follow rigidly, without discretion, its numerical results.

J. F. J.

SUMMARY OF TREASURER'S REPORT

RECEIPTS

Balance on hand December 1, 1919	\$ 5,184.72	
Receipts to date:		
Annual dues	\$6,990.27	
Life membership dues	150.00	
Registration fees	107.87	
Interest on investments	1,330.21	
Interest on bank account	39.64	
Voluntary contributions	1,652.60	
Royalties	49.70	
Sales of publications	111.33	
Miscellaneous	51.50	10,483.12
		<u>\$15,667.84</u>
Gifts, Andrew D. White Fund	1,000.00	
		<u>\$16,667.84</u>

EXPENDITURES

Office of secretary and treasurer	\$2,754.43	
Pacific Coast Branch	45.05	
Committee on Nominations	103.00	
Committee on Membership	71.35	
Committee on Programme	259.30	
Committee on Local Arrangements	50.00	
Conference of Historical Societies	23.15	
Committee on Publications	674.37	
American Historical Review	5,087.85	
Historical Manuscripts Commission	20.00	
Herbert Baxter Adams Prize	200.00	
Writings on American History	200.00	
American Council of Learned Societies	122.85	
London Headquarters	31.45	
Committee on Policy	133.68	
American Council on Education	10.00	
	<u>\$9,786.48</u>	
Investments	<u>1,850.20</u>	11,636.68
Cash balance November 31, 1920		<u>\$ 5,031.16</u>

BUDGET FOR 1921

APPROPRIATIONS

Office of secretary and treasurer	\$ 3,000.00
Pacific Coast Branch	50.00
Committee on Nominations	100.00
Committee on Membership	100.00
Committee on Programme	300.00
Committee on Local Arrangements	50.00
Conference of Historical Societies	25.00
Committee on Publications	700.00
Council Committee on Agenda	300.00
American Historical Review	7,000.00
Historical Manuscripts Commission	20.00
Winsor Prize	200.00
Writings on American History	200.00
American Council of Learned Societies	150.00
Committee on Bibliography	250.00
Committee on the Writing of History	75.00
	<u>\$12,520.00</u>

ESTIMATED INCOME

Annual dues	\$ 7,000.00
Sale of publications	100.00
Royalties	50.00
Interest	1,400.00
Registration fees	150.00
Miscellaneous	50.00
	<u>\$ 8,750.00</u>

AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

(referred, in accordance with the constitution, to the next annual meeting).

That in article III. there be substituted for "three dollars", "five dollars"; and for "fifty dollars", "one hundred dollars"; so that the article shall read:

Any person approved by the Executive Council may become a member by paying five dollars, and after the first year may continue a member by paying an annual fee of five dollars. On payment of one hundred dollars any person may become a life member, exempt from fees. Persons not residing in the United States may be elected as honorary or corresponding members and be exempt from the payment of fees.

AMENDMENT TO THE BY-LAWS

(referred to the next annual meeting).

That in by-law II. the word "nomination", line 1, be changed to "nominating", and the sentence beginning "At such", line 3, and ending "be chosen", line 7, be omitted; change "one day", line 14, to "two days"; so that by-law II. will read as follows:

A nominating committee of five members shall be chosen at each annual business meeting in the manner hereafter provided for the election of officers of the Association. It shall publish and mail to each member at least one month prior to the annual business meeting such nominations as it may determine upon for each elective office and for the next nominating committee. It shall prepare for use at the annual business meeting an official ballot containing, as candidates for each office or committee membership to be filled thereat, the names of its nominees and also the names of any other nominees which may be proposed to the chairman of the committee in writing by twenty or more members of the Association at least two days before the annual business meeting, but such nominations by petition shall not be presented until after the committee shall have reported its nominations to the Association as provided for in the present by-law. The official ballot shall also provide, under each office, a blank space for voting for such further nominees as any member may present from the floor at the time of the election.¹¹

¹¹ The references to lines are to the text of the by-law printed, as amended in 1917, in the *Annual Report* for that year, p. 58; see also p. 13, *ibid.* For the present year, the following resolution was adopted:

"Resolved, that the operation of the sentence in by-law II., beginning in the third line with the words 'At such convenient time' and ending in the seventh line with the words 'then to be chosen', namely, the operation of a preliminary referendum, be suspended during the year 1921."

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

President, Jean Jules Jusserand, Washington.

First Vice-President, Charles H. Haskins, Cambridge.

Second Vice-President, Edward P. Cheyney, Philadelphia.

Secretary, John S. Bassett, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.

Treasurer, Charles Moore, Library of Congress, Washington.¹²

Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, Patty W. Washington, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington.

Editor, Allen R. Boyd, Library of Congress, Washington.

Executive Council (in addition to the above-named officers):

James Ford Rhodes,¹³
John B. McMaster,
Simeon E. Baldwin,
J. Franklin Jameson,
George B. Adams,
Albert Bushnell Hart,
Frederick J. Turner,
William M. Sloane,
William A. Dunning,
Andrew C. McLaughlin,
George L. Burr,

Worthington C. Ford,
William R. Thayer,
Edward Channing,⁸
Arthur L. Cross,
Sidney B. Fay,
Carl L. Fish,
Carlton J. H. Hayes,
Frederic L. Paxson,
Ruth Putnam,
James T. Shotwell,
St. George L. Sioussat.

Committees:

Committee on Programme for the Thirty-Sixth Annual Meeting: Evarts B. Greene, University of Illinois, chairman (appointed for one year), Charles Seymour (appointed for two years), Walter L. Fleming (appointed for three years), Thomas M. Marshall, Norman M. Trenholme; and (*ex officio*) M. A. Olsen and John C. Parish.

Committee on Local Arrangements:

Committee on Nominations: Frank H. Hodder, University of Kansas, chairman; Henry E. Bourne, William E. Dodd, Eloise Ellery, William E. Lingelbach.

Editors of the American Historical Review: Carl Becker, Archibald C. Coolidge, Guy S. Ford, J. Franklin Jameson, Claude H. Van Tyne, Williston Walker.

Historical Manuscripts Commission: Justin H. Smith, 7 West Forty-third Street, New York, chairman; Annie H. Abel, Eugene C. Barker, Robert P. Brooks, Logan Esarey, Gaillard Hunt.

Committee on the Justin Winsor Prize: Clive Day, Yale University, chairman; Isaac J. Cox, Thomas F. Moran, Bernard C. Steiner, William W. Sweet.

Committee on the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize: Conyers Read, 209 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, chairman; Charles H. McIlwain, David S. Muzzey, Nellie Neilson, Bernadotte E. Schmitt, Wilbur H. Siebert.

¹² For the purposes of routine business the treasurer may be addressed at 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

¹³ The names from that of Mr. Rhodes to that of Mr. Channing are those of ex-presidents.

- Public Archives Commission*: Victor H. Paltsits, 48 Whitson Street, Forest Hill Gardens, L. I., New York, chairman; Solon J. Buck, Ralph D. W. Connor, Waldo G. Leland, Arnold J. F. Van Laer.
- Committee on Bibliography* (including the Manual of Historical Literature): George M. Dutcher, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., chairman; Sidney B. Fay, Augustus H. Shearer, Henry R. Shipman.
- Committee on Publications*: H. Barrett Learned, 2123 Bancroft Place, Washington, chairman; Allen R. Boyd, Library of Congress, Washington, secretary; and (*ex officio*) John S. Bassett, J. Franklin Jameson, Rodney H. True, Justin H. Smith.
- Committee on Membership*: Thomas J. Wertenbaker, 111 Fitz-Randolph Road, Princeton, chairman; Louise Fargo Brown, Eugene H. Byrne, August C. Krey, Frank E. Melvin, Richard A. Newhall, Charles W. Ramsdell, Arthur P. Scott, John J. Van Nostrand, jr., James E. Winston, George F. Zook.
- Officers of the Pacific Coast Branch*: Robert C. Clark, University of Oregon, president; Payson J. Treat, Leland Stanford University, vice-president; John J. Van Nostrand, jr., secretary-treasurer; executive council: the above, and Wilberforce F. Bliss, Sara L. Dole, Waldemar C. Westergaard.
- Conference of Historical Societies*: George S. Godard, Connecticut State Library, Hartford, chairman; John C. Parish, State Historical Society, Iowa City, secretary.
- Committee on National Archives*: J. Franklin Jameson, 1140 Woodward Building, chairman; Charles Moore, Oliver L. Spaulding, jr.
- Editors of the Historical Outlook*: Albert E. McKinley, 1621 Ransstead Street, Philadelphia, managing editor; Edgar Dawson, Sarah A. Dynes, Daniel C. Knowlton, Laurence M. Larson, William L. Westermann.
- Committee on Military History*: Eben L. Swift, 1823 Nineteenth Street, Washington, chairman; Allen R. Boyd, Roy B. House, Eben Putnam, Oliver L. Spaulding, jr.
- Committee on Patriotic Societies*: Dixon R. Fox, Columbia University, chairman; Natalie S. Lincoln, Henry B. Mackoy, Mrs. Annie L. Sioussat, R. C. Ballard Thruston.
- Committee on Service*: J. Franklin Jameson, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C., chairman; Elbert J. Benton, Clarence S. Brigham, Worthington C. Ford, Arthur C. Howland, Albert E. McKinley, James Sullivan.
- Committee on History Teaching in the Schools*: Henry Johnson, Teachers College, New York, chairman; Henry E. Bourne, Philip P. Chase, Guy S. Ford, Daniel C. Knowlton, Albert E. McKinley, Eugene M. Violette.
- Committee on Endowment*: Charles Moore, Library of Congress, Washington, chairman.
- Committee on obtaining Transcripts from Foreign Archives*: J. Franklin Jameson, 1140 Woodward Building, Washington, chairman; Charles M. Andrews, Waldo G. Leland.
- Special Committee on Bibliography of Modern English History*: Edward P. Cheyney, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia,

chairman; Arthur L. Cross, Roger B. Merriman, Wallace Note-stein, Conyers Read.

Special Committee on the Historical Congress at Rio de Janeiro: Bernard Moses, honorary chairman; Percy A. Martin, Stanford University, California, acting chairman; Julius Klein, Harvard University, secretary; Charles L. Chandler, Charles H. Cunningham, Constantine E. McGuire, Edwin V. Morgan, Manoel de Oliveira Lima, William L. Schurz.

Special Committee on the Documentary Historical Publications of the United States Government: J. Franklin Jameson, 1140 Woodward Building, chairman; Charles Moore.

Special Committee to formulate Rules for the George L. Beer Prize: William A. Dunning, Columbia University, chairman; Marshall S. Brown, Edward S. Corwin.

Special Committee on the Writing of History: Jean Jules Jusserand, 2416 Sixteenth Street, Washington, chairman; Wilbur C. Abbott, Charles W. Colby.